

USSN 10/679,834 - Page 6

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 12 have been amended, and claims 9 and 18 canceled. Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19-20 are pending in the application for consideration on the merits. Favorable consideration of this application as amended is requested.

Claim Objections:

Claims 9 and 18 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim.

Claims 9 and 18 have been canceled, thus rendering these objections moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the rejection is directed to the recitation "said first seal portion is a co-extruded member."

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to clarify that the frame and elastomeric seal, which are part of the first seal portion, are co-extruded. Consequently, applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andrzejewski et al. (US 5,038,521), hereafter referred to as Andrzejewski. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in the prior art reference.

Claim 7, as amended, is directed to "a reveal molding assembly comprising: a metal frame; an elastomeric material seal at least partially surrounding said metal frame; at least one outwardly extending projection formed on said seal; and a molding member attached to said seal, whereby when the reveal molding assembly is mounted on the first flanged connection point of the door header, said at least one projection frictionally engages with the step of the mounting surface to retain the reveal molding

USSN 10/679,834 - Page 7

assembly to the door header." For claim 7, then, the at least one projection is frictionally engaged with the step of the mounting surface when the reveal molding assembly is mounted on the first flanged connection point. This engagement between the step and projection helps to retain the reveal molding assembly on the door header.

Andrzejewski is directed to a window frame (8) having a first part of a sealing strip (24) mounted on a flange (18) of the window frame (8), and forming a channel (28) between the flange (18) and first part of the sealing strip (24). The fingers (unnumbered) extending into the channel (28) do not engage and are, in fact, clearly spaced a significant distance from any stepped surface in the window frame (8). The window frame (8) itself includes features (separate and spaced from the flange (18)) for retaining the first part of the sealing strip (24), namely, a channel (22) with a re-entrant part (23) extending partially across its mouth. A groove (32) and protrusion (30) combine to engage the re-entrant part (23). Thus, with regard to Andrzejewski, it does not teach or suggest at least one projection frictionally engaged with a step of the mounting surface of the first flanged connection point when a reveal molding assembly is mounted thereon. With at least this limitation of claim 7 missing from Andrzejewski, there cannot be anticipation of this claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Moreover, claims 8 and 10-11 depend from claim 7 and are thus distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed above relative to claim 7.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andrzejewski. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in the prior art reference.

Claim 12, as amended, is directed to "a seal and molding assembly comprising: a seal and molding portion adapted to be attached to the first flanged connection point, said seal and molding portion including a metal frame and an elastomeric material seal at least partially surrounding said metal frame, said seal forming a first projection and said frame having a hook flange extending therefrom; and a seal portion adapted to be attached to the second flanged connection point on the door header, said seal portion including a

USSN 10/679,834 - Page 8

second projection extending therefrom, whereby when said seal and molding portion is attached to the first flanged connection point and said seal portion is attached to the second flanged connection point, said first projection frictionally engages with the step of the mounting surface on the first flanged connection point to retain said seal and molding portion to the door header and said hook flange engages said second projection to retain said seal and molding portion and said seal portion on the door header."

For claim 12, then, the first projection is frictionally engaged with the step of the mounting surface when the seal and molding portion is mounted on the first flanged connection point. This limitation is completely missing from Andrzejewski, as discussed above relative to claim 7.

In addition, for claim 12, the frame of the seal and molding portion has a hook flange extending therefrom. Andrzejewski does not teach or suggest anything about a hook flange, let alone a frame having a hook flange. In fact, not only does Andrzejewski fail to teach or suggest a hook flange or a projection that would engage such a hook flange, but the first part of the sealing strip (24) does not even touch the second part of the sealing strip (52)—so the two cannot engage to retain either one on a door header.

With at least these limitations of claim 12 missing from Andrzejewski, there cannot be anticipation of this claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Moreover, claims 13-17, 19, and 20 depend from claim 12 and are thus distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed above relative to claim 12.

The mention of combining Nozaki with Andrzejewski in the 102(b) rejection of claims 12-20 does not appear to be appropriate since this would be a multiple reference anticipation of claims that is achieved by stating that the references are obvious to combine. In any event, as discussed below relative to claim 1, the two references will not combine to produce the claimed invention.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrzejewski in view of Nozaki (2001/0015035). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

USSN 10/679,834 - Page 9

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a "seal and molding assembly for sealing an automobile door to an automobile body, comprising: a first seal portion adapted to be attached to a first flanged connection point on an automobile door header, said first seal portion including a frame and an elastomeric seal at least partially surrounding said frame, and said first seal portion including a hook flange extending therefrom, with the frame extending into and forming a portion of the hook flange; and a second seal portion adapted to be attached to a second flanged connection point on the automobile door header, said second seal portion including a projection extending therefrom, whereby when said first seal portion is attached to the first flanged connection point and said second seal portion is attached to the second flanged connection point, said hook flange and said projection engage to retain said first and second seal members to the automobile door header." For claim 1, then, the first seal portion includes a hook flange, a frame and an elastomeric seal, with the frame extending into and forming a portion of the hook flange.

Andrzejewski is directed to a window frame (8) having a first part of a sealing strip (24) mounted on a flange (18) of the window frame (8), and a second part of a sealing strip (52) mounted on a flange (20) of the window frame (8). Andrzejewski, however, does not teach or suggest anything about a hook flange—let alone a frame forming a portion of a hook flange—or a projection that would engage such a hook flange. In fact, in Andrzejewski, the first part of the sealing strip (24) does not even touch the second part of the sealing strip (52)—so the two cannot engage to retain either one on a door header. Moreover, Andrzejewski teaches a groove (32) and protrusion (30) on the first part of the sealing strip (24) that engage with a channel (23) and re-entrant part (23) to retain the first part of the sealing strip (24) to the window frame (8). So there would be no motivation in Andrzejewski to add a redundant retention means (such as a hook feature as discussed below relative to Nozaki) to achieve a retention capability that can be provided by the groove (32) and protrusion (30).

Nozaki teaches nothing that will overcome the deficiencies in the teachings of Andrzejewski. Nozaki is directed to a vehicle door having an inner panel (15) and door sash (17) forming an exterior flange (17b) and an interior flange (15b, 17a). A rubber

USSN 10/679,834 - Page 10

glass run (20) and a rubber portion of a trim (18) mount to the flanges of the vehicle door as can be seen in the various embodiments. Only in the embodiment of Fig. 10 of Nozaki does the glass run (20) engage the trim (18) in such a way that one may surmise that a hook flange type member (interior holding lip 20j) exists on the glass run (20) to engage a protrusion (engagement protrusion strip 18i) on the trim (18). But the glass run (20) in Nozaki does not include a frame, so any such hook flange cannot have a portion formed by such a frame. Both the glass run (20) and trim (18) are completely rubber in the flanges and protrusions that extend toward and contact each other.

So, not only does Andrzejewski completely lack any type of hook flange or even any contact between the first and second parts of the sealing strips (24, 52), let alone a frame forming a portion of a hook flange, but Nozaki also fails to teach or suggest any frame forming a portion of a hook flange that will engage a projection on a second seal. The combination, therefore, does not form the claimed invention.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Andrzejewski in view of Nozaki. Claims 2-6 all depend from claim 1 and so are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Moreover, each of these dependent claims includes additional limitations that may further distinguish each one over the cited references.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In summary, the applicants believe that each formal and substantive requirement has now been met. The application is now believed to be in appropriate condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura C. Hargitt - Attorney
Reg. No. 43,989
Telephone: 313-665-4710